



**Input from Advisory and Technical Committees  
on Proposed Multi-Modal Alternatives  
Advisory Committee (April 17, 2001)  
Technical Committee (April 18, 2001)**

The following comments and questions were provided by the Advisory and Technical Committees regarding the proposed multi-modal alternatives to carry forward to second-level screening. These comments and questions do not represent consensus by the committees, but rather summarize the points raised by individual members.

**Alternative 1: No Action**

- Describe what action will take place in the corridor if no action is taken (i.e., preservation).

**Alternative 2: SR 520 Safety and Preservation, I-90 Light Rail**

- Clarify the addition of inside and outside shoulder widths. State reasons for having 10 foot inside, and 4 foot outside shoulders.
- HOV may not be necessary across the length of the bridge, as long as HOV is present on approaches.
- There should be an additional safety and preservation alternative to determine how the system works without any assumptions about where HCT would cross the lake.
- The assumptions for I-90 reduce the safety of that facility.

**Alternative 3: SR 520 HOV, I-90 Light Rail**

- Why must light rail be assumed on I-90?
- How will Mercer Island traffic be accommodated in the outer roadways on I-90, should the center roadway be converted to light rail?
- Amend the descriptions so that it is clear that HCT on I-90 would be light rail transit (LRT) to coincide with the use of the Seattle tunnel, and that HCT on the SR 520 corridor could be another technology.
- Remove Alternative 3 from further study, as Alternative 7 accomplishes essentially the same objectives and includes a wider footprint.

**Alternative 4: SR 520 HOV, GP, I-90 HCT**

- Remove Alternative 4 from further study, as Alternative 8 accomplishes essentially the same objectives and includes a wider footprint.

**Alternative 5: SR 520 HOV, SR 520 HCT**

- No significant changes suggested.

### **Alternative 6: SR 520 HOV, GP, SR 520 HCT**

- Move HCT connections in Fremont, Wallingford, University District, and Montlake to Alternative 8 so that Alternatives 5 and 7 can be evaluated without an extensive Seattle HCT route, and Alternatives 6 and 8 can be evaluated with an extensive Seattle HCT route.

### **Alternative 7: SR 520 HOV/BRT**

- HOV/BRT may cause additional congestion on local streets as BRT exits the SR 520 right-of-way. More information on how this would function was requested.

### **Alternative 8: SR 520 HOV/BRT, GP**

- Move HCT connections from Alternative 6 in Fremont, Wallingford, University District, and Montlake to Alternative 8 so that Alternatives 5 and 7 can be evaluated and compared without an extensive Seattle HCT route, and Alternatives 6 and 8 can be evaluated and compared with an extensive Seattle HCT route.
- HOV/BRT may cause additional congestion on local streets as BRT exits the SR 520 right-of-way. More information on how this would function was requested.

### **General Suggestions**

- All alternatives should include an acknowledgement that community enhancements and mitigation will be included.
- Some recommended eliminating all eight-lane alternatives (Alternatives 4, 6, and 8).
- Some recommended continuing to evaluate all eight multi-modal alternatives with comments about individual alternatives.
- Widths of the footprint as the roadway passes through communities should be clearly shown.
- Potential designs, such as double-decking, should be shown that may decrease the amount of widening required by the multi-modal alternatives.
- Some would like to see additional iterations of the multi-modal alternatives (such as interchange possibilities) before making decisions about them.
- Provide the interchange designs and traffic information to local jurisdictions prior to decisions regarding which alternatives should be evaluated in the draft EIS.
- Consider using HOV lanes for goods, as well as people.
- 108<sup>th</sup> Avenue should continue to function at an optimal level so that drivers are not encouraged to cut through other communities to reach SR 520.
- It is important to preserve the alternative of putting HCT on I-90 in the future.
- An alternative should continue to be evaluated that includes adding only a general purpose lane to the SR 520 corridor.
- If the transportation demand management strategy does not include pricing, then the TDM strategy should not be described as ‘aggressive.’
- Do not continue to consider closing the Lakeview exit from I-5 northbound.